

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated July 17, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on October 17, 2008. Applicants submit this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 9, 14-20, 22, 23 and 32-34 are pending in the application. Claims 9, 14-20, 22, 23 and 32-34 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 9, 16-17 and 32-34 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 9, 14-20, 22-23, 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by (*Rubin et al.* (US 2002/0099552)).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Rubin* does not disclose "each and every element as set forth in the claim". For example, regarding claim 1, *Rubin* does not disclose receiving an annotation to a portion of a first view of data, wherein a view of data is any collection of data containing a set of visible query-related sub-objects. Claims, 9, 17, 32 and 34 include similar claim limitations. On page 11 of the *Final Office Action dated July 17, 2008* (hereinafter, "*Final Office Action*"), the Examiner argues that a "view of data" is defined as a "presentation of data on a screen." See *Final Office Action*, page 11. Using this definition, the Examiner concludes that a "view of data can be any of the

document or pages viewed over time" as disclosed in paragraph [0006], lines 3-11 of *Rubin*. See *Final Office Action*, page 10.

However, the present claims explicitly state that the data contains a set of visible query-related sub-objects. Nowhere does *Rubin* disclose that a document or page is a query-related sub-object. In fact, the only instances where *Rubin* discusses a query of any kind is in regard to querying a database which stores audio annotations for a given document or page. See for example *Rubin*, para. [0052], lines 10-11, para. [0057], lines 9-13, para. [0059], lines 6-8, para [0060], lines 6-10. Thus, *Rubin* does not disclose receiving an annotation to a portion of a first view of data, wherein a view of data is any collection of data containing a set of visible query-related sub-objects.

Furthermore, because *Rubin* fails to disclose a set of visible query-related sub-objects, it follows that *Rubin* also does not disclose the additional claim limitations of claim 1, which include, analyzing the second view of data to identify query-related sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data, and providing an indication of the annotation in the interface, only if a predetermined set of query-related sub-objects visible in the second view of data are visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data, wherein providing an indication of the annotation in the interface comprises displaying an icon proximate one or more query-related sub-objects visible in the second view of data that are also visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data. Claims 17, 32 and 34 include similar claim limitations.

Therefore, the withdrawal of the rejection to claims 9, 17, 32, 34, and the claims that depend therefrom is respectfully requested.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact Gero McClellan, attorney of record, at (336) 643-3065, to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants